

a NASA center of excellence for space weather technology.

(b) **GEOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATIONS.**—In the report required by subsection (a), the Administrator shall consider the benefits of establishing the center of excellence described in that subsection in a geographic area—

(1) in close proximity to—

(A) significant government-funded space weather research activities; and

(B) institutions of higher education; and

(2) where NASA may have been previously underrepresented.

**SEC. 820. REVIEW ON PREFERENCE FOR DOMESTIC SUPPLIERS.**

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the Sense of Congress that the Administration should, to the maximum extent practicable and with due consideration of foreign policy goals and obligations under Federal law—

(1) use domestic suppliers of goods and services; and

(2) ensure compliance with the Federal acquisition regulations, including subcontract flow-down provisions.

(b) **REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall undertake a comprehensive review of the domestic supplier preferences of the Administration and the obligations of the Administration under the Federal acquisition regulations to ensure compliance, particularly with respect to Federal acquisition regulations provisions that apply to foreign-based subcontractors.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The review under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment as to whether the Administration has provided funding for infrastructure of a foreign-owned company or State-sponsored entity in recent years; and

(B) a review of any impact such funding has had on domestic service providers.

(c) **REPORT.**—The Administrator shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the review.

**SEC. 821. REPORT ON UTILIZATION OF COMMERCIAL SPACEPORTS LICENSED BY FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the benefits of increased utilization of commercial spaceports licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration for NASA civil space missions and operations.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description and assessment of current utilization of commercial spaceports licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration for NASA civil space missions and operations.

(2) A description and assessment of the benefits of increased utilization of such spaceports for such missions and operations.

(3) A description and assessment of the steps necessary to achieve increased utilization of such spaceports for such missions and operations.

**SEC. 822. ACTIVE ORBITAL DEBRIS MITIGATION.**

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) orbital debris, particularly in low-Earth orbit, poses a hazard to NASA missions, particularly human spaceflight; and

(2) progress has been made on the development of guidelines for long-term space sustainability through the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Administrator should—

(1) ensure the policies and standard practices of NASA meet or exceed international guidelines for spaceflight safety; and

(2) support the development of orbital debris mitigation technologies through continued research and development of concepts.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the status of implementing subsection (b).

**SEC. 823. STUDY ON COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.**

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) enhancing the ability of researchers to conduct and interact with experiments while in flight would make huge advancements in the overall profitability of conducting research on suborbit and low-Earth orbit payloads; and

(2) current NASA communications do not allow for real-time data collection, observation, or transmission of information.

(b) **STUDY.**—The Administrator shall conduct a study on the feasibility, impact, and cost of using commercial communications programs services for suborbital flight programs and low-Earth orbit research.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress and make publicly available a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subsection (b).

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued**

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

**UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4999**

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I am here on behalf of the millions of working people in this country who are out of time, who are out of luck, and who are just about out of hope. I am here on behalf of the millions of working people who have borne the worst of this pandemic, the people who got sent home back in March and April and May, when other businesses got to stay open, and when companies like Amazon and Facebook were making billions of dollars. These are the workers who lost their jobs, the workers who lost their pay, the workers who were told: Too bad for you.

These are people who right now are missing shifts at work to try to care for kids who are distance learning because of COVID, who are trying to care for a relative who may be sick. These are the people who are always asked to make it work, who are always asked to hold it together and, you know what, they do.

These are proud people, the working people of our Nation. These are strong people. These are the people who have rallied to this Nation's defense in every hour of need, in every moment of danger, who have sent their sons and

daughters to go fight our wars, who have given their time and their talents and their treasure at every opportunity for this Nation.

And now they are in need. They are the backbone of this Nation, and they are in crisis. I am talking about the 8 million Americans who have fallen into poverty since this summer; 12 million families—working families—who are now behind on their rent; the 35 percent of working families in America who have had to go ask for food assistance in the last couple of months because of this pandemic. Those are the people I am talking about.

I am talking about people like Susan, who is a single mother, a working mother, from my State in Northeast Missouri, where she lives. She wrote to me the other day, and she is trying to home school her kids who are home because of COVID. She doesn't have internet because she is in a rural part of the State. She doesn't have broadband. She is trying to feed her family. She is trying to stay up with her job, but she has to miss shifts at work because she has got kids at home whom she is trying to home school and supervise. Now she has fallen behind on her rent. She told me, and these are her words:

I am not asking for handouts. I am just asking for a chance to get back on my feet.

Earlier this week, a friend of mine down in Southeast Missouri, the boot heel of Missouri, in a town called Charleston, was helping to distribute food to families in need. He said that there were 30 church groups—30—who lined up to come get food for their congregations, and over 60 families—this is a small town—there were over 60 families who stood in line, and as they were loading food into the trunks of people's cars, many of them were crying.

What these people ask for, what these Americans ask for is not for government to solve all their problems. It is not for government to give them a handout. It is a chance to get back on their feet, a chance to provide for themselves, a chance to recover when they have been asked, again, to sacrifice so much.

That is why the least this body can do is to provide direct relief to every working American who needs it. That is what we did back in March that every Senator voted for: \$1,200 for every working individual, \$2,400 for working couples, 500 bucks for kids and dependents. It is the least that we can do. It should be the first thing that we could do.

As these negotiations drag on and on, fixated and focused and hung up on who knows what issues, let's start with this. Let's send a message to working families that they are first, not last; that they are the most important consideration, not some afterthought. Let's send that message today.

Surely, we can agree that the working people of this country deserve relief, and if we are going to spend hundreds of billions of dollars on bailing

out this, that, and the other, surely, surely, we could start with reasonable, modest relief to the working people in need in this Nation.

What I am proposing is what every Senator has supported already this year. What I am proposing is modest compared to the scope of the need. What I am proposing will give working folks in my State and across this country a shot—a shot—here before Christmas at getting back up on their feet, getting back to work, and getting back in a position to be able to provide for themselves, these folks who are the backbone of this Nation.

I am here today to ask that this body take up and pass this relief measure: \$1,200 for individuals, \$2,400 for couples, \$500 for kids.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill at the desk; I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President. First of all, I want to say to my colleague from Missouri that I certainly share and I think every Senator in this Chamber shares his concern for people who are hurting because of this COVID pandemic. Businesses have closed. People are on unemployment. People are in need through no fault of their own.

This is an act of God, and that is one of the reasons why I certainly supported the CARES Act. That was over \$2 trillion. In total, this body has passed well over \$3 trillion, 15 percent to 16 percent of last year's GDP in terms of financial relief.

My comments here are really not directed specifically at the proposal of the Senator from Missouri because he makes many good points. We do have working men and women, we have households that—again, through no fault of their own—are struggling, and we need to provide financial support. I think my comments are, in some respect, more general from the standpoint of how we have done that.

As I have explained to my colleagues in conference, by and large, the initial need packages here were a shotgun approach. We had to move fast. We had to do something big. We had to make sure that markets wouldn't seize, that financial relief could be sent to people very quickly, and so we passed over \$3 trillion in financial relief. I knew it would be far from perfect. It was far from perfect.

But now we have had a lot more time, and anything we consider for this additional package that we are considering now that is being debated, that is being discussed, that is being negotiated, ought to be far more targeted.

One of the reasons we are currently \$27.4 trillion in debt, which is about 128

percent of last year's GDP—if we do this bipartisan deal, another trillion dollars, we will be \$28.4 trillion in debt in the next 3 or 4 months. That is 132 percent of GDP.

When I came to the Senate, we were a little over \$14 trillion and our GDP was over \$15 trillion, and we were actually below 100 percent of GDP.

I know I am using a lot of numbers right now, and I am going to use more because that is part of the problem.

One of the reasons we are \$27.4 trillion in debt is, we only speak about need; we only talk in terms of compassion. We all have compassion. We all want to fulfill those needs. We just don't talk in numbers very often. We don't analyze the data. We don't take a look at what we did in the past and see, did it work or didn't it work? What was spent well? What was wasted?

So I didn't have enough time to do charts. It would be a little bit easier. But let me go through numbers, and I will go through slowly so that people can understand at least my perspective of why I am so concerned about our Nation's debt and the fact that we are mortgaging our children's future. I think we need to be very careful about mortgaging it further when we aren't doing it in a targeted fashion.

So, again, before the COVID recession hit, in December 2019, we hit a record number of people employed in this country. There were 158.8 million people employed. That was a record. Our economy was humming. Because of President Trump's administration, they put forward a reasonable level of regulation and competitive taxes. That brought back the entrepreneurial spirit that supercharged the economy. We were at 3.5 percent unemployment. When I took econ, 5 percent was considered full employment. We were at 3.5 percent unemployment.

Then, COVID hit and, by April, we had gone from almost 159 million people employed in this country to just a little over 133 million people, so that was a reduction in employment of a little more than 25 million people—again, from 159 million to 133 million, 25 million fewer people employed in this Nation.

Now, the good news: Even though the pandemic is still not over and the vaccine is being delivered, and it is being administrated—I think the end is in sight—we have already gained 16 million people employed, so now employment stands at 149.7 million people; 150 million people are employed—down about 9 million jobs—9 million.

I want you to keep those numbers in mind because they are important. Our unemployment rate stands at 6.7 percent. By the way, the number of people unemployed, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which has a little bit different calculation, is about 10.7. So, in this, somewhere between 9 million and 11 million people are currently unemployed.

Now, in the CARES Act—again, which I supported because we had to

provide relief—we did provide economic impact payments, which Senator HAWLEY wants to just duplicate—no changes, no modifications, no further targeting. Those economic impact payments were about \$275 billion to 166 million people. Remember, 25 million people lost their jobs, but we sent our checks to 166 million people, averaging about \$1,673 per person. What may be a more relevant figure is how many households we sent those checks to. We sent them out to about 115 million households at about \$2,400 per household.

So, again, \$275 billion to 115 million households—that was about 4.5 more households than the number of jobs lost. Today, with only 9 million jobs lost, not only—I mean, that is a big number, a big number. I am not minimizing that. With 9 million jobs lost, if we just repeat it—send out to another 115 million households—that is 12.6 times the number of jobs lost. And if we double it, it goes from \$275 billion to \$550 billion. That is half a trillion dollars.

I know a trillion doesn't sound like much anymore. It seems like hundreds of billions seem more, but now that we are dealing in \$1 trillion or \$2 trillion, it is pocket change apparently.

I think it is important to ask: Well, how was that money spent? Did it really—was it really spent on essentials? Was this money really needed? Was there any hope, actually, of that money being stimulative to our economy?

Well, we have one study from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. They issued it on October 13 of 2020. What they did is, since 2013, they have been sending out in the internet a national survey to 1,300 households called the Survey of Consumer Expectations, and with COVID, they decided to send out two special surveys—one in June and one in August.

Here is what those survey results said. Of the \$2,400 per household in the June survey, 18 percent of that \$275 billion was spent on essential items; 8 percent was spent on nonessential; 3 percent, on donations, for a total of 29 percent spent. This is what they call the marginal propensity to consume, 29 percent. Of the other 71 percent, equally divided, 36 percent of that was saved, so our Nation's savings rate increased, and 35 percent went to pay off debt—credit card debt.

They also asked the same question about what happened to the unemployment payments. Very similar results: 24 percent of those unemployment payments—the plus-up to \$600 per week to stay on unemployment benefits—24 percent was spent on essential consumption, 4 percent on nonessential, 1 percent on donations for, again, the same percent: 29 percent was the marginal propensity to consume from the unemployment payments; 71 percent, for savings and for debt repayment.

They also looked ahead, assuming that we are going to do another round

of stimulus checks. This time they asked their respondents: How would you spend \$1,500 if you got a check? This time respondents said that they would spend about 14 percent on essential consumption, 7 percent on non-essential, 3 percent on donations, for a total of 24 percent that would be the marginal propensity to consume—24 percent—and 76 percent, again, on savings and debt repayment.

So I don't think you can take a look at these direct payments to individuals as stimulative. Obviously, 18 to 24 percent was spent on essential items. We ought to figure out how to provide that money so that people can spend it on essentials. Again, that is only 18 to 24 percent maximum.

I do want to talk a little bit about past stimuli. I personally don't believe they do much to stimulate the economy. I think the best way to stimulate the economy is, again, what this administration has done: Lower regulation to a reasonable level—nobody argues for no regulation; we need a reasonable level—and have a competitive tax system.

I fear, in the next administration, we may just repeat the mistakes of the Obama-Biden administration, and here is the proof of their mistakes. Again, remember those employment numbers: a record of about 159 million, currently 150 million people, being employed. Well, back during the great recession, prior to that, we did have employment of about 146 million people in January 2008. By December 2009, that had dropped to 138 million people employed. But when President Obama took office, he had total control of Congress—a filibuster-proof majority here in the Senate—and, within a month, they enacted the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act—\$787 billion of proposed spending. In February of 2009, there were 141.6 million Americans working—141.6—and the unemployment rate was 8.3 percent. Again, it continued to dip to December 2009 when it got down to 138 million. It took us 3 years from February 2009 to get back to 141.6 million Americans working, and that is with an \$800 billion—roughly, \$800 billion—stimulus package that did not work, but it further mortgaged our children's future by another \$800 billion.

I wish these things worked. A quick aside: Part of that American Recovery and Reinvestment Act—again, Democrats had total control, with a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate. Do you know how much they plussed-up State unemployment benefits to help the unemployed, those 8.3 percent of Americans? They plussed it up by a whopping \$25 per week, and now they are arguing that \$300 per week, which I believe is the current proposal, isn't enough. It kind of makes you wonder, doesn't it?

So, in summary, kind of reviewing these numbers, we currently are at 6.7 percent unemployment. I don't recall ever, in U.S. history, when we have

even begun to think that we should even spend \$100 billion to stimulate an economy at 6.7 percent unemployment.

But this is different. We have underemployed; we have families in need. There is no doubt about it. I completely support some kind of program targeted for small businesses so they can reemploy and so they can reopen to restore capital. Their life savings have been wiped out. I have proposals. They have been ignored.

So what I fear we are going to do with this bipartisan package and what the Senator from Missouri is talking about is the same thing—a shotgun approach. We will not have learned the lessons from our very hurried, very rushed, very massive earlier relief packages. We will just do more of the same—another trillion dollars. It takes our debt from \$27.4 trillion to \$28.4 trillion in a couple of months with doing virtually no revisions, no improvements and, similar to what the Senator from Missouri is talking about in terms of these economic impact payments, no revisions at all—just spend another \$275 billion and send it out to 115 million households when we are currently at about 9 million fewer jobs than we were in a record economy before the COVID recession.

So, for all those reasons, I not only object to what Senator HAWLEY is proposing here, but I am certainly lodging my objection to what is barreling through—the train has left the station—on the package being negotiated right now that is way too big, that authorizes more money, even though we have \$600 billion there just for repurposing, no new authorization required. There are 52 Republicans who supported it, but that is not good enough. We have to throw another \$300 to \$400 billion on top, which is \$300 to \$400 billion more that we are mortgaging our children's future without reforms and without targeting. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his perspective, which I always appreciate, and, of course, I appreciate working with Senator JOHNSON on some of the issues.

On this issue, I am afraid we are just going to have to differ, and I just want to say this: Nothing could be more targeted and no relief could be more important than relief for working people. The Senator is right; this body has spent trillions of dollars this year alone on COVID relief. We are getting ready to spend, apparently, another trillion dollars more. Yet working people are told they may be last—if they get relief at all.

I don't think the American people understand that. I know people in Missouri don't understand it, and I would just urge Members of this body: Go home and try explaining that to the people of your State. Go ahead. Just

try it. Try telling them why this body can bail out the banks. We bailed out the banks to such a tune that now they have money left over. Now we are going to take money back because we spent so much on Wall Street and the banks in the first part of this year. That is right.

In fact, now I understand that my Democratic colleagues don't want to shut down all of the bank money. Who knows what we might be able to do with that in the future? Oh, they are fine. They are more than fine. They are doing great. Now Wall Street is doing great. Big tech, they are doing great; the big multinational corporations, fantastic. Working people—working people are living in their cars. Working people can't go to the doctor. Working people can't pay their rent. Working people can't feed their children. They should be first, not last.

And it is no answer for this body to tell them: Go get in an unemployment line. Really? That is the response? Go get in an unemployment line.

No, the working people of this country, frankly, deserve better. They deserve to be the top priority just like they have made this country the top priority in their lives and their families.

This is not the end of this fight. I am here right now on this floor. Senator SANDERS will be back in a matter of hours to ask again for the same measure. Again, I have been proud to partner with him on this effort, and I will keep working with whomever it takes for however long it takes until we get the working people of this country relief.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4605

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, 3 days ago, I came to the floor and spoke in honor of the life of Tyler Herndon, a Mount Holly, NC, police officer who lost his life just days before his 26th birthday last week. He was laid to rest this week.

Now 5 days after his murder and 3 days after my remarks, I am devastated to report that another officer in North Carolina has lost his life in the line of duty. Wednesday night, the Concord Police Department received a call about a crashed, abandoned car on I-85 just outside of Charlotte. Responding officers were alerted that the suspect had attempted to steal a woman's car while she was still in it.

Officers Jason Shuping and Kaleb Robinson tracked and identified the suspect on foot. As they approached the suspect, he pulled out a handgun,

and he shot both of these brave officers. Tragically, Officer Shuping died at the scene. Thankfully, Officer Robinson is recovering at the hospital. Officer Shuping was just 25 years old—the same age as the officer we memorialized this week, Tyler Herndon.

I am just devastated by this. These brave officers had begun their careers in law enforcement and had nowhere to go but up. They were serving our community, and they were doing it with honor.

We talk a lot about the sacrifice given by law enforcement officers who day in and day out are serving our communities and putting themselves in harm's way, and it is dispiriting to think that these fallen officers, at the very beginning of their careers, have already made the ultimate sacrifice in the name of public safety and community safety.

Families in North Carolina and in each of our States are about to endure their first Christmas without their loved ones. We owe so much to these families whose parents, spouses, siblings, children, and grandchildren have given everything in the line of duty.

On Tuesday, when I spoke on Officer Herndon, I said that in the next Congress, I would be moving forward with the Protect and Serve Act again. This act increases penalties for people who murder or assault police officers. But in light of another police officer's death—the second one in a week in North Carolina, in the suburbs, just around the corner from where I live, 10 or 15 minutes away—I think we have to elevate the discussion now and send a very clear message to those who would harm police officers that if you do, then there are going to be dire consequences to pay for it. We owe it to the police officers to let them know that Congress cares about them. We should send this message.

This is a simple bill. It only focuses on those who are so brazen that they would murder a police officer in the line of duty, assault them, ambush them—all the things you have seen; now 48 murders in this year alone.

The best thing we can do is to pass this commonsense legislation and send a message to these people who are taking away the men and women serving our communities.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 4605 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Protect and Serving Act of 2020 that has been offered by my colleague and friend Sen-

ator TILLIS creates a new Federal crime that would punish assaults on law enforcement officers, including State and local officers, by up to 10 years and up to life if death results from the offense or the offense involves kidnapping, attempted kidnapping, or attempt to kill.

Let me say at the outset that I had a few seconds to communicate with my colleague before this official colloquy on the floor.

I say to the Senator, I sensed in your voice and what you told me how personal this is to you. This just isn't the killing of a law enforcement officer, which is a tragedy all of itself. It is your neighborhood. It is your community. As you said, some of these officers, you know their families, and it is very personal.

I want to say first, I offer my condolences to the families and colleagues of Officer Jason Shuping, who lost his life in Concord, NC, and Officer Tyler Avery Herndon, who lost his life in Mount Holly in the line of duty in North Carolina in the last few weeks. These are terrible tragedies.

We had a similar situation, of all places, in the Loop in Chicago just a couple of years ago—Commander Paul Bauer. What a spectacular man he was in service to the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois. He was murdered in the Loop. Unfortunately, his poor young family had to go through the ordeal not only of the funeral but also, then, of the trial of the suspect. I raise that only because Paul Bauer's assailant was successfully prosecuted by the State of Illinois and was given a life sentence just recently.

As is the case in most of these situations, to my knowledge, I would say to the Senator from North Carolina, every State, including his own, takes this very seriously and prosecutes cases of harm involving law enforcement officers.

The individual responsible for shooting Officer Shuping is dead. If he had lived, he would have been prosecuted for a capital offense in North Carolina. The individual who allegedly shot Officer Herndon has been indicted for first-degree murder in North Carolina.

So it raises the question, why is it necessary to create a Federal crime for something already being successfully prosecuted in every State in the Nation? Assaults on police officers are already criminalized with enhanced penalties, as they should be, and assaults on Federal officers are already Federal offenses. I have a lengthy list here, which I will not read to you, of all of the Federal statutes that already provide for punishment up to death and a life sentence for those Federal officers who would be shot or harmed in any way.

So let me say this to my friend and colleague from North Carolina: I thank you for standing up on the floor and bringing this matter to our attention. We should never overlook the fact that these men and women serve us self-

lessly and risk their lives in the process. It has happened here in the Capitol. It happens in every corner of America, sadly. But let's save this for another day. Let's take this up in the new Congress, which is about to start in just a few days. Let's address this issue, as well as the issue of how to make the plight of our law enforcement officers safer and more effective. To deal with issues involving that, I think, would be a balanced approach to this, which would serve justice.

For those reasons, I will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I am obviously disappointed in the objection from my friend and colleague from Illinois, but I do believe that we have to start recognizing that something bad is happening—48 murders, hundreds of assaults, ambushes, premeditated attacks.

I do understand the idea that maybe you could prosecute it through existing law, your Federal or State law, but we have an epidemic of "abolish the police, defund the police," marginalizing the police, that suggests to me that even if there are pathways now to properly prosecute these brazen criminals, we have to cut through some of the rhetoric that, honestly, I believe is the responsibility for some of these unprecedented numbers of murders and assaults.

So although I am disappointed with the objection today, I look forward to working with my colleague on the Judiciary and others to do everything we can to pass the Protect and Serve Act and to send a very clear message to these increasingly less safe communities and more threatened law enforcement officers that we are going to do everything we can to make our communities safe and to make a police officer's job as safe as it can be.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, there is a lot going on and not enough of some things we really need to go on going on.

But I think it is worth noting again—lest the moment be lost somehow in all the back and forth and all the chaos—that we have reached a watershed moment in the war against COVID-19.

As you know, the first successful vaccine was approved last week. I watched online as the Vice President of the United States and his wife received the vaccine. I applaud them for demonstrating their confidence, which should be all of our confidence, that this vaccine is not only effective but also safe.